

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-14 are now in the application. Claims 1-14 are subject to examination. Claims 5-14 have been added.

In item 2 on pages 2-3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-4 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,205,124 to Hamdi (hereinafter Hamdi) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,531 to Kumar (hereinafter Kumar) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The object of the instant application is to provide a multimedia end device for the realization of H.323 multipoint connections. According to the invention, the multimedia end device includes a controller for signal processing for point-to-multipoint connections as well as a mixer for mixing the datastreams from all the conference participants (including the datastreams from the multimedia end device itself which also functions as a standalone communications terminal) and for distributing data stream mixtures to all of the conference participants.

Hamdi discloses a conferencing system 151 that is connected to an analog telephone network POTS 181 via a first and a second modem 182, 186 in order to communicate with a first

and a second remote modem 180, 188 via the telephone network 181. So-called DSVD modems (digital simultaneous voice and data) are used as the modems 180, 182, 186 and 188, by which voice and data can be transmitted in parallel via an analog telephone line. For this purpose, the data and voice are converted into analog signals within the transmission bandwidth of the POTS by the DSVD modem. Thus, the essential aspect in Hamdi is to be seen in realizing a conferencing circuit, where, in addition to voice, data are also to be transmitted. According to the Examiner, Hamdi discloses a controller and a mixer for accomplishing this task. However, the controller and mixer 169 in Hamdi are integrated in the centralized system 151 for communicating with the remote terminals 180, 188. In contrast, the multimedia terminal of the instant application functions as both a remote terminal and the centralized system. For Hamdi to perform the same function, the centralized system 151 would have to be incorporated in the remote terminals 180, 188.

The Examiner further states that Hamdi does not teach a multimedia terminal for telephony based on ITU-T Standard H.323 for setting up a multipoint connection to a plurality of terminals. The Examiner incorporates the teachings of Kumar, which describes a conference system based completely on a digital protocol, ITU-T standard H.323 for setting up a teleconference connection between the remote DSVD terminals

180, 188 of Hamdi. In addition, the Examiner states that Hamdi suggests the use of ITU Standard for the DSVD multipoint control unit processing.... As noted in the previous responses Applicant respectfully disagrees and states that there is no reason to incorporate the ITU-T Standard H.323 in Hamdi as this would result in significant changes to the hardware requirements of Hamdi resulting in increased costs (contrary to the Examiner's opinion).

In item 3 on pages 3-5 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-4 have been rejected as being obvious over Kumar in view of Hamdi under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As the Examiner notes Kumar fails to teach a mixer, connected to the controller, for mixing the data streams originating from all the respective terminals. The Examiner states that Hamdi teaches such a mixer and therefore it would be obvious to incorporate it in the invention taught in Kumar. It is noted that the multipoint control unit MCU 218 taught in Kumar is not a media terminal and merely coordinates the conferencing needs from the various remote terminals and does not act as a standalone communication terminal by an end user. Therefore, the combination recited by the Examiner does not read on the claims of the instant application which recites a remote terminal that also functions as a conference call coordinator.

New claims 5-14 have been added to the application.

Support for new claims 5 and 10 is found on page 6, lines 14-23 of the specification of the instant application which describes how the multimedia terminal can function in a multipoint-to-multipoint manner.

Support for new claims 6 and 11 is found on page 16, lines 12-26 of the specification of the instant application which describes how the multimedia terminal sets up a consultation connection.

Support for new claims 7 and 12 is found from page 14, line 24 to page 15, line 3 of the specification of the instant application and as shown in Fig. 1.

Support for new claims 8, 9, 13 and 14 is found from page 16, line 12 to page 17, line 2 of the specification of the instant application and from Fig. 2 which describes how the multimedia terminal sets up a conference call connection.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 3. Claims 1 and 3 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art.

The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1 or 3.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-14 are solicited.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Any extension fee associated therewith should be charged to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph E. Locher
Registration No. 41,947

January 6, 2006
Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100 Fax: (954) 925-1101